

**\*REVISED\* AGENDA**

**COMMITTEE ON JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS**

**October 19, 2020**

**2:00 p.m.**

Chairman Beaudry called the meeting to order.

Due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this committee is authorized to meet electronically.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Shaw, Long Terrio, School Committee Members Porter, Soule, Beaudry

Messrs.: J. Gagne, K. DeFrancis

4. Southside 5th Grade Inclusion Update.

Josh Gagne, Chief of Facilities, stated the 5<sup>th</sup> grade inclusion project is effectively complete. The remaining aspect of it is the outdoor play space. That was approved in the Finance and Facilities committee meeting and we are still waiting full school board approval for that to proceed.

Chairman Beaudry asked does anyone have any questions on the Southside renovation project.

Alderman Terrio stated just to confirm, the building aspect of the project is all done but we are just waiting to move kids in. Is that correct?

Mr. Gagne answered yes. The building is complete and I believe it was decided that kids would move in a year later so next fall.

Chairman Beaudry stated that was my understanding although the 5<sup>th</sup> graders won't be moving into Southside until September 2021.

Alderman Terrio asked so three middle schools are completed.

Chairman Beaudry answered no. We only have one complete and this is the second one.

Alderman Terrio stated I was under the impression that this was the third middle school.

Chairman Beaudry responded no. McLaughlin and Hillside are not completed.

Alderman Long stated with respect to change orders, some of them say that the owner requested them. Who are we referring to as the owner?

Mr. Gagne replied that would be the school district.

Alderman Long asked so on all of these change orders, the BOSC voted to authorize them.

Mr. Gagne answered no. As you can imagine, this project was a summer project so time is limited. We carved out a contingency of \$50,000 knowing that we would have things that would come up. As we had weekly project meetings, some things just came up and you can see the dollar amounts and the school district

would either approve or reject different things that came up. If we had to go back to a committee for approval, which meets monthly, we would never get the project done on time.

Alderman Long asked so is it a true statement that the construction project has the authority to spend the monies set aside for unforeseen expenses or owner requested changes. Is that correct because of the timeframe?

Mr. Gagne responded right. When we bid out the project, we carved out a contingency. We could have said no contingency and the contractor would have borne the risk. In that case, we probably would have paid more. What we did is we built a contingency account that gave us some flexibility in deciding what to spend money on. Some things are just unknown.

Alderman Long replied I get that but I am trying to figure out the flexibility and who has that flexibility. I was always under the impression that the BOSC or whatever subcommittee or this committee had to approve spending the contingency money but I am hearing that is not the case so I am trying to figure out who has the authority.

Mr. Gagne stated the school board did approve the entire project amount, which included the contingency so in effect they did approve that amount. For example, on 5/15, an issue came up to provide a disconnect switch for a transformer for \$464. Is that something that we need to go back to a committee or board for approval on or the next item, spraying fire resistant material on a beam? It is necessary and has to happen because it is a code issue. Does that really require going back to the school board and asking for a vote?

Alderman Long responded that is what I am trying to determine. I am not hearing who has the authority to spend that money. I am hearing that if there is \$100,000 in contingency, the people overseeing the construction have the authority to spend that \$100,000 without this committee or any other committee's approval.

Mr. Gagne stated the amount is \$50,000 and in weekly progress meetings these issues came up and we forwarded them to the school district and they decided or approved what they wanted.

Alderman Long asked so the school district administration approves spending the contingency money. Is that correct?

Mr. Gagne answered yes.

Chairman Beaudry stated in the past and this is no reflection on anybody but when I was on this committee under the design-build and also when we closed in Highland Goffes Falls and Parkside and even Webster if there were any change orders and I believe if it was over some amount like \$2,500 they had to come back to the Joint School Buildings Committee for permission. If the scope of the project changed, it had to go back to the school board for approval. To say that because we okayed the \$50,000 contingency...that doesn't mean it is a slush fund that anybody can tap into. I have to say that I am as concerned as Alderman Long is when I look at an owner request for a \$7,400 IT thing which I know for a fact because I spoke to people in IT that the only reason they requested it was because they weren't involved in the original bidding process and when they went in to look at the IT lab there weren't drops for the computers so they had to wire the room to be conducive to the computers that were going to go in there. Field condition. Can you explain to me what that is? It says Southside door changes, field condition, for \$7,100. What is that and why do we get this after the fact?

What happens if the school board didn't want to make that change? What would take place?

Mr. Gagne stated the scope of the project didn't change. These are just field conditions that popped up in trying to execute what was voted on. We didn't change the scope of work. I would say that IT drops really aren't a design issue. They are just required. That is why we have a contingency. It is to incorporate that work. The other issue is that we have been meeting monthly. We are discussing things that happened back in May.

Chairman Beaudry stated we haven't met monthly and it is not your fault. I think this is only our second meeting on this project. We did not meet over the summer.

Karen DeFrancis, Business Administrator, stated I agree that any substantial changes like a change in the project it is something that would come back to this committee for approval and if it was a major change where it had to go back to the school board we might have to consider that. Anything is part of the project that was missed like when you talked about IT and I think there was also a door added at some point or whiteboards added, those are things that should have been considered and really are part of the scope of the project but they weren't added into the budget. Those types of things we have been adding without coming back to the committee. I think if it is a substantial change like we talked about at one of our meetings the ramp that we are looking at then that would have to come to committee. The reason it isn't going to come back to this committee is because we are taking that out of deferred maintenance because it is more of a deferred maintenance item than a project item. That was my understanding of what comes back to the committee for approval. I agree that it is based on a dollar amount although I don't think we ever set that dollar amount. Is it \$2,500 or is it \$5,000?

I think again if it is changing the scope of the project it is something that would have to come back to the committee.

Alderman Long stated I don't have an issue with what is going on. The only issue I have is trying to get my arms around who is authorizing this. It appears that there is some confusion. In Section 199.3 of the statute it says all funds appropriated for the construction of a new schoolhouse shall be administered by the appropriate Joint School Buildings Committee and those funds shall be disbursed upon authorization of the committee. I just need clarity on whether the school administration authorizes this and if that is okay or if this committee authorizes it. As far as something that we need to be code compliant, I get that. The \$2,700 for the fire resistant material is for code compliance and I can't see this committee saying no we don't want to be code compliant. I don't have an issue with that but the IT issue was mentioned. It isn't that we would have to vote to approve that but who gives the authority to do it? My concern is we are \$300 over the contingency budget. How far does that go? Does it come back to us with a \$7,000 deficit in contingency? That is what concerns me. As a member of this committee part of my responsibility is to oversee the expenditure of these funds and make sure the work is getting done. I don't have that knowledge.

Chairman Beaudry stated for the next project that we have, we could put a monetary value like anything over \$2,500 has to come back to committee for approval. I don't mind having a special meeting and now that we are doing things virtually we can have meetings any time we want. That would be the will of this committee. I totally agree that this is different than the other projects that I oversaw when I was on this committee. They always came back to us for approval on any of those issues.

Alderman Terrio stated I think Ms. DeFrancis put it nicely. Obviously we expected there would be problems because we put \$50,000 in contingency. There is a thing called agency law where you allow your designee to make changes. My only concern with what you just mentioned is this committee meets too infrequently and I think it would be a roadblock when time is of the essence. What I would recommend is if you are concerned about going over the contingency account is that to be more flexible it should be a decision made between the school committee members and the administration. I think coming in front of this committee should be more of an after the fact. I just don't see this committee meeting frequently enough to give permission when time is of the essence. I think it would throw a wrench in the works. I would recommend that the school board handle that amongst themselves and the administration office.

Chairman Beaudry stated the only thing is the school board wasn't aware of any of this either. The only updates we get are the ones we get on the Buildings Committee. The three of us sit on that committee and we haven't seen any of these things until it came before this committee. If you want to comfort your concerns, we can put something in where if it is going to slow the project down then we allow them to move forward but we need an update of the changes. I am just throwing that out there.

School Committee Member Soule asked is it possible when we are doing a project like this that there can be a quick update once a month as part of our Finance committee meetings so we would know if something came up and we needed to make changes. I don't want to add any work to Karen but I think a couple of minutes and if there are no updates we won't put it on the agenda but that way you have a connection.

Chairman Beaudry stated that is a good suggestion. Josh, how did we get to \$310.63 in the red in contingency? How did we allow that to happen?

Mr. Gagne replied to go back to Committee Member Soule's point, this change order request log was submitted throughout the project with every agenda so it should not come as a surprise to anyone. It was proof as we moved along.

Chairman Beaudry stated no disrespect but the last one we had was well over a month ago and we still had about \$20,000 left in the contingency account. I remember Alderman Long asked a question about contingency and how it is being spent and how much we were going to spend. We were definitely not in the red at that point. Lisa can probably tell us. I don't know if it was because of Covid or what but I know I have been trying to get a Joint School Buildings Committee for at least a month. We didn't have anything over the summer that I can remember.

Ms. DeFrancis stated I believe we had a meeting in July.

Chairman Beaudry stated Alderman Long you have the RSA. Does it say we have to meet monthly? I believe it says that we have to doesn't it?

Alderman Long answered yes it does say that the Joint School Building committee shall meet monthly and at other times as the chairman deems necessary.

Chairman Beaudry stated we missed the boat on that one. Moving forward, we are going to have to do that. I don't know what the best way to get in touch with you is to have these meetings held but I would definitely like to have them monthly and as things progress if we have to have them weekly I don't mind doing that to get the project done. We still have McLaughlin and Hillside to be done. I don't want the same thing happening with those two schools.

Lisa McCarthy, Clerk, stated we can schedule your monthly meetings. I think it is the third Monday of every month.

School Committee Member Soule asked do we have any upcoming projects that we need to be involved in. I am thinking of the outside playground. I am not sure if this committee has to oversee that.

Chairman Beaudry replied yes that is a bonded project.

School Committee Member Soule asked so any bonded projects we will need to meet on.

Ms. DeFrancis stated it is not just bonded. This outside project is not bonded. I originally thought it was just for bonded projects as well but I believe it is for any substantial changes to the buildings. This one is funded through our general fund but it is an \$800,000 project and that is why Joint Schools is overseeing it.

Chairman Beaudry stated and we still have the hangar that we are working on that has been slowed down due to the Fire Department needing to inspect it.

School Committee Member Porter asked is there a way to utilize phone polls in order to get...we don't want to slow down a construction project. It seems like a lot of this stuff, even if we do start meeting monthly...if the goal is to try to approve stuff before it happens that will still be too late. Do we need to have a system where an update comes through and we do it on a phone poll or via email that we are giving approval? If not, what is the point to saying to somebody we have a contingency budget, use it? It sort of feels like we are getting upset about them using something we told them to use.

Chairman Beaudry stated I understand what you are saying and I don't mind the phone poll. I am as open as anybody wants to be. If we want to do phone polls...again I am not putting blame on anybody but I think this was a summer project and we wanted to move quickly on it but the next two that come up we should have a little more oversight and know what is going on and hopefully we will have monthly meetings. If there is something that comes up and we have to have a phone poll, I don't have a problem with that as long as we can get the back-up documentation so we know what we will be voting on.

Alderman Long stated I am just going by what the statute of this Joint School Buildings Committee says. Even though there is a contingency and even with respect to agency law I don't know if this committee has the authority to delegate our responsibilities to somebody else. I don't believe that is the case. I mean it states that this committee oversees and decides all matters relating to any construction. I agree with School Committee Member Porter that maybe a phone poll would be an expedited way of doing this. Like I said, instead of setting a number like \$2,500...I mean if they want to spend \$200 we are supposed to be overseeing that so delegating that responsibility to somebody else I don't think is in the best interest of the taxpayers with respect to these school buildings. That is our responsibility – every \$50 or \$10 spent. I am not saying it to be onerous. I get the holding up of a project which is not always good to do. The company is going to charge you if they have to wait around for a week or a month for a decision and rightfully so and we don't want that. A phone poll is reasonable. I just wanted to get my arms around who the owner was who is responsible. I think it is this committee. Maybe we set a different policy. Maybe the owner is school administration or the principal or whoever. I am just saying the buck stops with this committee and however we want to proceed is up to this committee.

Chairman Beaudry replied I agree. The only thing is the reason we have this committee and the reason the law reads that way is because we have the aldermen who are the ones who finance a lot of this through our budgets involved. I can see that. The principal should have a say but some principals, if you have \$100,000 sitting there, will want to spend it. I think there has to be some oversight on what we want to spend it for and is it part of our priority. There has to be a check and balance. I agree with everything that is being said this afternoon. What does this committee want to do, if anything, moving forward.

School Committee Member Soule asked is there a Clerk of the Works and I think I asked this before. Is it Josh?

Mr. Gagne answered we have a Clerk of the Works from Facilities. I am not the Clerk of the Works.

School Committee Member Soule stated I am just thinking because in any projects that I have been involved in, the committee has worked with the Clerk of the Works as they go between person because that person knows the project specifically and then the JBC was involved from that aspect. That is from my own experience.

Alderman Shaw stated I have been on this committee for four or five years and every time we met monthly and each time Josh would come before us and give us an update on what was spent and if there was money that needed to be spent in addition to what was already spent he would tell us what those expenses were and we would either approve them or not. Nine times out of ten we just approved them but they were brought before us and there was never a question like this. The second thing is I don't know what the deficit is and where you see a deficit. All I see is -\$310. Is that what we are upset about?

Chairman Beaudry responded we are not upset. We are just asking because the contingency was \$50,000 and they went over that amount by \$310.63.

Alderman Shaw asked are you aware that costs of things have also doubled and maybe their initial estimate was X amount and we approved that but when it came to actually doing the work and using those materials the cost went up so it ended up being over.

Chairman Beaudry answered that could well be but if this was your house and you had a checkbook that had \$50,000 in it and you were building something and all of the sudden it came to \$50,300 and you don't have the \$300, what would you do. That is the only question. I am not squabbling over the \$300.

Alderman Shaw replied I understand and I think that what Alderman Long and School Committee Member Porter said was that when it reaches that point then Mr. Gagne should call the chairman of this committee and say we have a problem and need to approve something and we can take care of that even if it is a phone poll. I am in agreement with that.

Chairman Beaudry stated I did just read the RSA and Alderman Long is correct. Under item c) it says we are supposed to get a monthly financial report relating to the total authorized construction budget and expenditures to date. That is to go to both the city council and the school board. It sounds like the aldermen didn't get anything and I know the school board didn't get anything. We did get it for our facilities meeting but this is only our second meeting on this project since it started back in June. I am not going to belabor it anymore. We can move on.

*School Committee Member Soule moved to meet monthly with whomever the person is that is coordinating the project and that person should be in contact with the chair of this committee if there is anything that comes up during that month that we might need a phone poll to approve. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Terrio stated before we do that, it is not that I am against that but don't we have free legal advice from the NH Municipal Association.

Chairman Beaudry stated we belong to the School Board Association.

Alderman Terrio asked and it is free legal advice right.

Chairman Beaudry answered yes.

Alderman Terrio stated before we make this motion, we might want to get a legal opinion which is free as to what would make us in compliance with the RSA and how we oversee these projects.

Chairman Beaudry stated I think School Committee Member Soule's motion is really what we should be doing anyway. We are just solidifying what we should be doing. We should be following the law.

*Chairman Beaudry called for a vote. The motion carried on a unanimous roll call vote.*

Alderman Shaw stated I just wanted to add that Mr. Gagne has been more than efficient in his reporting to the Joint Buildings Committee. I have been on this committee for at least two and possibly three terms and he has always been

extremely accurate and willing to cooperate. I think this is a very good thing and he will agree to being cooperative with us.

Chairman Beaudry stated I know he will. He has been very good working with us on the school side. I have no doubt that will happen.

Mr. Gagne stated if the playground is approved by the full board, what we would like to do is work with the DPW engineer and Parks & Recreation to design it and put together the bid documents in-house. Once we have those documents, we will do an RFP and put it out to bid. Hopefully we can choose a contractor by January/February and be ready to go for the summer. That is our process and our schedule. I can keep you updated on that as it moves forward.

5. MST Hangar Update.

Mr. Gagne stated I was reading some email traffic today from the state Fire Marshall's Office. It looks like they have completed their work and approved everything. We just need to get the approval from the state back to the Planning Department so we can get our permit. The contractor, Schroeder Construction, took a risk and ordered the building. That should arrive in the first week of November. Hopefully by then our permit is in place. I anticipate probably mid-December or late December completion. I have to verify the schedule. It is all contingent on when the building arrives but I believe it was a 4-6 week duration.

Chairman Beaudry stated on page 4.4 of the agenda, it says "access to this new wing by only from the exterior; there is no direct access from the "A" wing." So the kids are going to have to go outside the building and then back in to get into the hangar?

Mr. Gagne responded I believe so.

Chairman Beaudry stated I assume there are enough exits for means of egress right. They would need more than one exit out of that building.

Mr. Gagne replied I believe so. Everything meets code. Originally we priced it out as a four-sided building or stand-alone building but there were cost savings in doing a three-sided building.

Chairman Beaudry stated it would just be one less firewall you have to build right.

Mr. Gagne answered right. There were a number of issues there. It was just easier and less expensive to do a three-sided building against the shop even with all of the codes considered than it was to do a stand-alone building. Either way the kids would still have had to go outside to get to the building just like they do when they go to the portables.

Alderman Long asked do we know what brand the pre-engineered building is.

Mr. Gagne responded I don't offhand but I can get you that information.

Chairman Beaudry stated I know they built the building big enough but a 24' x 24'...they are not going to have the wings on these planes or do they put the wings on after they build it.

Mr. Gagne replied I believe they put the wings on after just because of transportation and all of that. They build all of the components, the fuselage and the wings, but they just don't attach them.

Chairman Beaudry stated I did see that in the old building but I didn't know if they were going to build a hangar big enough to build the whole plane there but then they wouldn't be able to transport it so I guess that makes sense unless we build a runway out there and then they can fly it off.

*There being no further business, **Alderman Long** moved to adjourn. **Alderman Shaw** duly seconded the motion. Chairman Beaudry called for a vote. The motion carried on a unanimous roll call vote.*

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Clerk of Committee

*Kevin A. Sheppard, P.E.*  
Public Works Director

*Timothy J. Clougherty*  
Deputy Public Works Director

*Josh Gagné*  
Chief Facilities Manager



*Commission*  
*Toni Pappas*  
*Patrick Robinson*  
*James Burkush*  
*Trixie Vazquez*  
*Armand Forest*

**CITY OF MANCHESTER**  
*Department of Public Works*  
*Facilities Division*

**To:** Arthur Beaudry  
**From:** Josh Gagne  
**Date:** Sept 18, 2020

**Subject:** Joint Building Committee Agenda:

**I. Southside 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Inclusion**

The building aspect of the project is effectively complete.  
Outdoor play space and classroom are yet to be determined.

Project budget: Period to 8/31/2020

		<u>8/31/20</u>
Construction contract:	\$ 559,853	\$ 610,163.63
Architectural fees:	\$ 24,900	\$ 0.00
Estimated moving fees:	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000.00
Project contingency:	\$ 50,000	\$ -310.63
Outdoor play space est.	\$ 50,000	
Outdoor classroom	\$100,000	

**II. MST Hangar:**

Project is delayed due to the State Fire Marshall.  
Schedule is undetermined.

Contract: \$ 244,000  
Phase 1: Slab install is worth \$ 78,000 and is complete  
Phase 2: Metal structure \$ 166,000

Sincerely,

Josh Gagné  
Chief of Facilities  
603-792-5304



# Change Request Log with Detail

Project Manager: Duane Provencher

20-1346 Southside School Reno Summer20

Number	Date	Description	Schedule Impact	Source	Reason	Amount	Status	Approved Date	Change Order
01	5/15/20	Provide Disconnect Switch for Transformer	None	RFI 6	Owner Request	464.87	Approved	5/14/20	1
02	5/15/20	Patching Sprayed Fire Resistive Materials SFRM at Removed Operable Wall Beams	None	RFI 8	Unforeseen Condition	2,716.95	Approved	5/14/20	1
03	5/15/20	Remove Ceilings in Classroom 121.5 & 129.6	None	RFI 10	Unforeseen Condition	3,887.86	Approved	5/15/20	1
04	5/15/20	5 each Additional 12'x4' Markerboards - Change 3 each 8'x4' Markerboards to 12'x4'	None	RFI 7	Owner Request	5,900.40	Approved	5/21/20	1
05	5/27/20	Southside Door Changes	none	RFI 2 & 4	Field Condition	7,153.29	Approved	5/28/20	1
06	5/27/20	CMU Wall Extensions in Locker Rooms	none	RFI 09	Unforeseen Condition	2,770.65	Approved	5/28/20	1
07	6/1/20	Additional IT work and Quad Outlet Revised	None	Other	Owner Request	7,446.00	Approved	6/3/20	1
08	5/27/20	Expansion Joint Repairs Room 124	None	Other	Field Condition	2,728.32	Approved	5/28/20	1
09	6/1/20	Glazed Block Repair and Masonry Corner Metal Closure	none	Other none	Owner Request	2,325.57	Approved	6/1/20	1
10	5/27/20	Concrete Ramp at Front Entry	30	Other FD #002	Owner Request	0.00	Submitted		
11	6/1/20	Add Electrical Outlets Rooms 121.5 and 129.6	none	RFI 11	Unforeseen Condition	1,971.00	Approved	6/1/20	1
12	6/18/20	Room 121.5 & 129.6 Rubber Flooring at Raised Expansion Joint	none	Other Meeting #4	Unforeseen Condition	295.11 **	Approved	6/23/20	2
13	6/4/20	Remove TV's from Classrooms, patch and paint walls	none	Other Meeting #5	Owner Request	3,229.00	Approved	6/5/20	1
14	6/10/20	Credit for 24 Hardware Cores to owner		None	None	-1,370.49 **	Approved	6/10/20	2
15	6/25/20	Hallway Doors		Other Job Meeting	Owner Request	8,491.65 **	Approved	7/22/20	2
16	7/15/20	4x4 Tackboards and Corner Guards		Other Meeting #9	None	2,300.45 **	Approved	7/22/20	2
17	7/7/20	Repair Concrete Slab at Exterior Columns		Other Meeting #9	Owner Request	1,125.43	Denied		
18	7/8/20	Paint Radiators and Electrical Panels in Hallways at Southside		Other Meeting #9	Proposal Request	6,199.01	Denied		
19	7/16/20	Accessible Parking at Southside Main Entrance	30	Other FD #003	None	0.00	Submitted		

Change Request Log with Detail

Schroeder Construction Mgmt, Inc.	Date: 7/30/2020
Original Contract Amount:	559,853.00
Approved Contract Changes:	50,310.63
Revised Contract Amount:	610,163.63
Pending Contract Changes:	

\*\* Approved price amounts have not yet updated the accounting approved and revised contract amounts, but are included in the approved and revised contract amounts in the Contract Summary.

## **Addition to Manchester School of Technology**

10 September 2020

### **Narrative prepared for Plan Review Submission to State of New Hampshire, Division of Fire Safety**

The Manchester School of Technology (MST), located at 100 Gerald Connors Circle, Manchester is facility of 124,101 square feet. It is divided into four structures, separated by fire-rated assembly wall construction. (Note attached plan) The facility was originally constructed in the mid 1980's, with a substantial addition and renovation taking place from 2006-2009, and is home to the high school programs of residential construction, auto maintenance and body shop repair, culinary arts, cosmetology, nursing, video production, horticulture and landscaping, and manufacturing technology, among other programs of study. The facility is also home to a hybrid offering of traditional high school classes in English, mathematics, and the sciences, aligned to the technological programs that are offered here.

This new addition is planned as an addition to the wing wherein the manufacturing technology program is located and is dedicated to the construction of a small airplane, a part of the program.

The proposed one-story addition of 24' x 24', or 576 square feet is a pre-engineered structure, or construction classification IIB. It is being added to the west end of the existing structure, adjacent to the 'A' Wing. The existing structure of MST is classified as IIIB, Non-combustible, unprotected; occupancy is Group E, educational. As the existing exterior wall of the 'A' Wing is constructed of masonry and rises above the highest point of the single sloped metal roof of new pre-engineered metal building addition, an inherent rating of one-hour is given to the wall. Access to this new wing by only from the exterior; there is no direct access from the 'A' Wing.

The fire suppression system and fire alarm of the existing building shall be extended to this new addition, along with appropriate emergency and exit lighting and fire alarm detection and notification devices. This wing will be heated and illuminated.

The project is funded by grants and does not have funding participation by the Department of Education. It does not fit their funding formulas, is budgeted below their project funding entry level, and did not fit their funding application scheduling.

The project has been preliminarily reviewed by the Manchester Fire Department and the Fire Prevention Office. They will continue to remain involved in the review of the design and executed work through to completion of construction.